



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,107	12/08/2003	Yasufumi Tsumagari	246401US2S	3052
22850 7590 08/28/2007 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER ZHAO, DAQUAN	
			ART UNIT 2621	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 08/28/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/729,107	TSUMAGARI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daquan Zhao	2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3. Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date
:11/21/2006;7/15/2005;6/21/2005;6/7/2004;4/16/2004;4/16/2004.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1 and 7 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4 and 9 of copending Application No. 10/682,876. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1 and 7 of this application are broader than claims 4 and 9 of the copending application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

4. Claims 2-4, 8-10 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4 and 9 of copending Application No. 10/682,876 (#876) and further in view of Yamamoto et al (US 7,194,196 B2). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

Regarding claims 2 and 8, #876 fail to teach the contents contain a title assigned with a title number, the title contains predetermined playback information assigned with time information, the expansion information contains at least one segmented expansion information, one segmented expansion information contains header information and main body expansion information, the header information contains a title number and time information, and the playback unit plays back predetermined main body expansion information on the basis of the title number and time information contained in the header information of the segmented expansion information in synchronism with playback of predetermined playback information contained in the title of the contents.

Yamamoto et al teach the contents contain a title assigned with a title number, the title contains predetermined playback information assigned with time information (e.g. figure 1, VTS#1, VTS#2...VTS#n, wherein each pack of the video, audio and subpicture header contains SCR, column 4, line 50- column 5, line 48); the expansion information contains at least one segmented expansion information (e.g. column 20,

lines 14-28, ATT search pointer #1 is described in the first title used by system controller 100, wherein the ATT corresponds to the one segmented expansion information). one segmented expansion information contains header information and main body expansion information (e.g. figure 5, the AMG corresponds to the header and ATS#1 and ATS #2 corresponds to the main body expansion information). the header information contains time information (e.g. column 5, lines 41-48 and column 14, lines 47-57, SCR) and the playback unit plays back predetermined main body expansion information on the basis of the title number and time information contained in the header information of the segmented expansion information in synchronism with playback of predetermined playback information contained in the title of the contents (e.g. column 19, lines 19-34 and column 20, lines 14-28, the system controller 100 reproduce the video and audio data in synchronism according to the header, wherein the audio data is time-adjusted to synchronize with the corresponding video data and column 18, lines 52-55 teaches the header is extracted from each pack).

Yamamoto et al also teach the title number in figures 5 and 6 (ATS#1 or ATS#2), but Yamamoto et al fail to specify the tile number could be contained in the header. Yamamoto et al teach including the time information (the SCR in the video and audio pack) in the header to synchronize the video data and audio data for playback and the system has to know the title number of the audio to the corresponding video. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to also to modify the teaching of Yamamoto et al to include the title number in the header and incorporate the teaching into #876 to achieve the same result through various

design incentives (see court decision in KSR international Co. v. Teleflex Inc. : F.

Known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations would have been predictable to one ordinary skill in the art).

Claims 3 and 9 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 2 above, wherein figure 1VOB ID#1, VOB ID #2 of the VTS 3 correspond to the chapter and chapter number, column 5, lines 4-9.

Claims 4 and 10 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 2 above, wherein the index time corresponds to the SCR time information and the position information corresponds to the title number since figure 5 shows the ATS#2 positions after ATS #1 and VTS#2 positions after VTS#1.

5. Claims 5 and 11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4 and 9 of copending Application No. 10/682,876 (#876) and Yamamoto et al (US 7,194,196 B2) as applied to claims 1-4 and 2-10 and further in view of Miyata et al (US 2003/0007779 A1). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

See the discussion above.

Regarding claims 5 and 11, #874 and yamamoto et al fail to teach the storage unit comprises first and second storage units which store a predetermined type of expansion information of the expansion information acquired by the second acquisition

unit, and the first and second storage units alternately store and output a plurality of pieces of segmented expansion information which form the predetermined type of expansion information. Miyata et al teach a first and second storage alternately store information (e.g. figure 2, memory 16 and 17, paragraph [0028]). It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Miyata et al into the teaching of Yamamoto et al and #876 to prevent lost of data (Miyata et al, paragraph [0006]).

6. Claims 6 and 12 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4 and 9 of copending Application No. 10/682,876, Yamamoto et al (US 7,194,196), Miyata et al (US 2003/0007779A1) as applied to claims 1-5 and 7-11 and further in view of official notice. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

See the teachings above.

Regarding claims 6 and 12, #876, Yamamoto et al teach wherein the storage unit comprises first and second storage units which store one of first and second types of expansion information of the expansion information acquired by the second acquisition unit (e.g. figure 10, demultiplexer 86, which also corresponds to a second acquisition unit, obtains audio data, Sad, and subpicture data, Ssp, from the DVD1 and sends it to the audio buffer 92, and subpicture buffer 89, column 19, lines 19-34);

#876 and Yamamoto et al fail to teach alternately store and output a plurality of pieces of data. Miyata et al teach alternately store and output a plurality of pieces of data (see the discussion of claims 5 and 11 above). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made using the first and second storage units taught by Yamamoto alternately store and output a plurality of pieces of segmented expansion information to form the first type of expansion information to increase the recording and reproduction speed.

Yamamoto et al, #876 and Miyata et al fail to teach integrating the first and second storage. The examiner takes official notice for integrating the first and second storage. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the first and second storage unit when the second type of expansion information is to be stored to increase the storage space:

7. Claim 7 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4 and 9 of copending Application No. 10/682,876 Yamamoto et al (US 7194196 B2) as applied to claims 1-12 above. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

Regarding claim 7, claims 4 and 9 of #876 fail to teach a plurality of segment files, each segmented file having a data field that stores audio information as playback information and a header field that stores control information of segment file, and the control information having title information and chapter information of contents and time information indicating a time from the beginning of a title or the head of a chapter

Art Unit: 2621

Yamamoto et al teach a header control information in column 19, lines 19-34. Yamamoto et al also teach including the time information (the SCR in the video and audio pack) in the header to synchronize the video data and audio data for playback and the system has to know the title number of the audio to the corresponding video (e.g. column 18, lines 52-56 and column 5, lines 40-48). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to also include the title information and chapter information in the header to achieve the same result through various design incentives (see court decision in KSR international Co. v. Teleflex Inc. : F. Known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations would have been predictable to one ordinary skill in the art).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

8. Claims 1 and 7 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of copending Application No. 10/742,903 (#903)

Claims 1 and 6 of #903 encompass all the limitations of claims 1 and 7 of the instant applications.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

9. Claims 2-4, 8-10 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of copending Application No. 10/742,903(#903) and further in view of Yamamoto et al (US 7,194,196 B2). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

Regarding claims 2 and 8, #903 fail to teach the contents contain a title assigned with a title number, the title contains predetermined playback information assigned with time information, the expansion information contains at least one segmented expansion information, one segmented expansion information contains header information and main body expansion information, the header information contains a title number and time information, and the playback unit plays back predetermined main body expansion information on the basis of the title number and time information contained in the header information of the segmented expansion information in synchronism with playback of predetermined playback information contained in the title of the contents.

Yamamoto et al teach the contents contain a title assigned with a title number, the title contains predetermined playback information assigned with time information (e.g. figure 1, VTS#1, VTS#2...VTS#n, wherein each pack of the video, audio and subpicture header contains SCR, column 4, line 50- column 5, line 48); the expansion information contains at least one segmented expansion information (e.g. column 20, lines 14-28, ATT search pointer #1 is described in the first title used by system controller 100, wherein the ATT corresponds to the one segmented expansion

information). one segmented expansion information contains header information and main body expansion information (e.g. figure 5, the AMG corresponds to the header and ATS#1 and ATS #2 corresponds to the main body expansion information). the header information contains time information (e.g. column 5, lines 41-48 and column 14, lines 47-57, SCR) and the playback unit plays back predetermined main body expansion information on the basis of the title number and time information contained in the header information of the segmented expansion information in synchronism with playback of predetermined playback information contained in the title of the contents (e.g. column 19, lines 19-34 and column 20, lines 14-28, the system controller 100 reproduce the video and audio data in synchronism according to the header, wherein the audio data is time-adjusted to synchronize with the corresponding video data and column 18, lines 52-55 teaches the header is extracted from each pack).

Yamamoto et al also teach the title number in figures 5 and 6 (ATS#1 or ATS#2), but Yamamoto et al fail to specify the tile number could be contained in the header.

Yamamoto et al teach including the time information (the SCR in the video and audio pack) in the header to synchronize the video data and audio data for playback and the system has to know the title number of the audio to the corresponding video. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to also to modify the teaching of Yamamoto et al to include the title number in the header and incorporate the teaching into #903 to achieve the same result through various design incentives (see court decision in KSR international Co. v. Teleflex Inc. : F.

Known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the

same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations would have been predictable to one ordinary skill in the art).

10. Claims 5 and 11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of copending Application No. 10/742,903 (#903) and Yamamoto et al (US 7,194,196 B2) as applied to claims 1-4 and 2-10 and further in view of Miyata et al (US 2003/0007779 A1). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

See the discussion above.

Regarding claims 5 and 11, #874 and yamamoto et al fail to teach the storage unit comprises first and second storage units which store a predetermined type of expansion information of the expansion information acquired by the second acquisition unit, and the first and second storage units alternately store and output a plurality of pieces of segmented expansion information which form the predetermined type of expansion information. Miyata et al teach a first and second storage alternately store information (e.g. figure 2, memory 16 and 17, paragraph [0028]). It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Miyata et al into the teaching of Yamamoto et al and #903 to prevent lost of data (Miyata et al, paragraph [0006]).

11. Claims 6 and 12 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of copending Application No. 10/742,903, Yamamoto et al (US 7,194,196), Miyata et al (US 2003/0007779A1) as applied to claims 1-5 and 7-11 and further in view of official notice. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

See the teachings above.

Regarding claims 6 and 12, #903, Yamamoto et al teach wherein the storage unit comprises first and second storage units which store one of first and second types of expansion information of the expansion information acquired by the second acquisition unit (e.g. figure 10, demultiplexer 86, which also corresponds to a second acquisition unit, obtains audio data, Sad, and subpicture data, Ssp, from the DVD1 and sends it to the audio buffer 92, and subpicture buffer 89, column 19, lines 19-34);

#876 and Yamamoto et al fail to teach alternately store and output a plurality of pieces of data. Miyata et al teach alternately store and output a plurality of pieces of data (see the discussion of claims 5 and 11 above). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made using the first and second storage units taught by Yamamoto alternately store and output a plurality of pieces of segmented expansion information to form the first type of expansion information to increase the recording and reproduction speed.

Yamamoto et al, #903 and Miyata et al fail to teach integrating the first and second storage. The examiner takes official notice for integrating the first and second

storage. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the first and second storage unit when the second type of expansion information is to be stored to increase the storage space.

12. Claim 7 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of copending Application No. 10/742,903 (#903) and Yamamoto et al (US 7194196 B2) as applied to claims 1-12 above. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

Regarding claim 7, claims 4 and 9 of #903 fail to teach a plurality of segment files, each segmented file having a data field that stores audio information as playback information and a header field that stores control information of segment file, and the control information having title information and chapter information of contents and time information indicating a time from the beginning of a title or the head of a chapter. Yamamoto et al teach a header control information in column 19, lines 19-34. Yamamoto et al also teach including the time information (the SCR in the video and audio pack) in the header to synchronize the video data and audio data for playback and the system has to know the title number of the audio to the corresponding video (e.g. column 18, lines 52-56 and column 5, lines 40-48). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to also include the title information and chapter information in the header to achieve the same result through various design incentives (see court decision in KSR international Co. v. Teleflex Inc. : F. Known work

in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations would have been predictable to one ordinary skill in the art).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

13. Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamamoto et al (US 7,194,196 B2).

Regarding claim 1, Yamamoto et al teach an information playback apparatus comprising:

- a first acquisition unit configured to acquire contents from an information storage medium (e.g. figure 10, demultiplexer 86, which corresponds to the first acquisition unit, obtains video data,SV, from

the DVD1 and sends it to the video buffer 87, column, column 18, lines 57-65);

- a second acquisition unit configured to acquire expansion information from **at least one of** the information storage medium and an external apparatus via a communication line (e.g. figure 10, demultiplexer 86, which also corresponds to a second acquisition unit, obtains audio data, Sad, from the DVD1 and sends it to the audio buffer 92, column 19, lines 19-34);
- a storage unit configured to store the expansion information acquired by the second acquisition unit in accordance with a type of information (e.g. the audio buffer 92 corresponds to the storage unit and the "type information" corresponds to video, audio, and subpicture data, wherein these three type of data are separated by the demultiplexer 86 and stored in the video buffer 87, audio buffer 92 and subpicture buffer 89 accordingly); and
- a playback unit configured to play back the contents acquired by the first acquisition unit, and to play back the expansion information stored in the storage unit in synchronism with playback of the contents (e.g. column 19, lines 19-34, the video and audio data are synchronized and figure 10 is a DVD player as mentioned in column 17, line 40).

Claim 7 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 1 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 2, 3, 4, 8, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al (US 7,194,196 B2).

Regarding to claims 2 and 8, Yamamoto et al teach

- the contents contain a title assigned with a title number, the title contains predetermined playback information assigned with time information (e.g. figure 1, VTS#1, VTS#2...VTS#n, wherein each pack of the video, audio and subpicture header contains SCR, column 4, line 50- column 5, line 48);
- the expansion information contains at least one segmented expansion information (e.g. column 20, lines 14-28, ATT search pointer #1 is described in the first title used by system controller 100, wherein the ATT corresponds to the one segmented expansion information).
- one segmented expansion information contains header information and main body expansion information (e.g. figure 5, the AMG corresponds to the header and ATS#1 and ATS #2 corresponds to the main body expansion information).

Art Unit: 2621

- the header information contains time information (e.g. column 5, lines 41-48 and column 14, lines 47-57, SCR) and
- the playback unit plays back predetermined main body expansion information on the basis of the title number and time information contained in the header information of the segmented expansion information in synchronism with playback of predetermined playback information contained in the title of the contents (e.g. column 19, lines 19-34 and column 20, lines 14-28, the system controller 100 reproduce the video and audio data in synchronism according to the header, wherein the audio data is time-adjusted to synchronize with the corresponding video data and column 18, lines 52-55 teaches the header is extracted from each pack).

Yamamoto et al also teach the title number in figures 5 and 6 (ATS#1 or ATS#2), but Yamamoto et al fail to specify the title number could be contained in the header. Yamamoto et al teach including the time information (the SCR in the video and audio pack) in the header to synchronize the video data and audio data for playback and the system has to know the title number of the audio to the corresponding video. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to also include the title number in the header to achieve the same result through various design incentives (see court decision in KSR international Co. v. Teleflex Inc. : F. Known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the

same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations would have been predictable to one ordinary skill in the art).

Claims 3 and 9 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 2 above, wherein figure 1VOB ID#1, VOB ID #2 of the VTS 3 correspond to the chapter and chapter number, column 5, lines 4-9.

Claims 4 and 10 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 2 above, wherein the index time corresponds to the SCR time information and the position information corresponds to the title number since figure 5 shows the ATS#2 positions after ATS #1 and VTS#2 positions after VTS#1.

15. Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al (US 7,194,196 B2) as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Miyata et al (US 2003/0,007,779 A1).

See the teaching of Yamamoto et al above.

Regarding claims 5 and 11, Yamamoto et al fail to teach a first and second storage alternately store information. Miyata et al teach a first and second storage alternately store information (e.g. figure 2, memory 16 and 17, paragraph [0028]). It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Miyata et al into the teaching of Yamamoto et al to prevent lost of data (Miyata et al, paragraph [0006]).

Art Unit: 2621

16. Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al (US 7,194,196 B2) and Miyata et al (US 2003/0,007,779 A1), as applied to claims 1, 5,7 and 11 above, and further in view of Official Notice.

Regarding claim 6 and 12, Yamamoto et al teach wherein the storage unit comprises first and second storage units which store one of first and second types of expansion information of the expansion information acquired by the second acquisition unit (e.g. figure 10, demultiplexer 86, which also corresponds to a second acquisition unit, obtains audio data, Sad, and subpicture data, Ssp, from the DVD1 and sends it to the audio buffer 92, and subpicture buffer 89, column 19, lines 19-34);

Yamamoto et al fail to teach alternately store and output a plurality of pieces of data. Miyata et al teach alternately store and output a plurality of pieces of data (see the discussion of claims 5 and 11 above). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made using the first and second storage units taught by Yamamoto alternately store and output a plurality of pieces of segmented expansion information to form the first type of expansion information to increase the recording and reproduction speed.

Yamamoto et al fail to teach integrating the first and second storage. The examiner takes official notice for integrating the first and second storage. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the first and second storage unit when the second type of expansion information is to be stored to increase the storage space.

Art Unit: 2621

17. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al (US 7,194,196-B2) as applied to claims 1-4 and 7-10 above, and further in view of Lamkin et al (US 2002/0,088,011 A1).

See the teaching of Yamamoto et al for claims claims 1-4 and 7-10 above.

Regarding claim 13, Yamamoto et al fail to teach acquiring information from an external apparatus via a communication line. Lamkin et al teach acquiring information from an external apparatus via a communication line (e.g. paragraph [0070]). It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Lamkin et al into the teaching of yamamoto et al to enhance the multimedia content with supplemental content (Lamkin et al, [0022]).

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kanazawa et al (US 6,580,870 B1); deCarmo (US 6,138,175); Lord (US 2003/0235407 A1); Chung et al (US 2003/0,049,017 A1);

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daquan Zhao whose telephone number is (571) 270-1119. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Fri. 7:30 -5, alt Fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tran Thai Q, can be reached on (571)272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Daquan Zhao



THAI Q. TRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ELECTRONIC BUSINESS CENTER 2800

Tran Thai Q
Supervisory Patent Examiner